

Date: Mon, 29 Aug 94 04:30:20 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #400
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 29 Aug 94 Volume 94 : Issue 400

Today's Topics:

 Code Must GO! or sta
Questions: Digital Scanning, Cellphones, Transmissions
 Quit whining and learn the damn code
 Repeater Coordination (qu

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 28 Aug 1994 03:48:36 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
wupost!udel!news.sprintlink.net!jupiter.planet.net!earth.planet.net!
billsohl@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code Must GO! or sta
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jeffrey Herman (jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu) wrote:
: In article <40.3198.2427@channel1.com> alan.wilensky@channel1.com
: (Alan Wilensky) writes: : >
: >I will take up the topic of removal of the cw test. I have a very
: >complete folder of research from several services that have dropped the
: >code altogether.

: But you apparently still don't have an HF receiver to listen to all
: that CW that your 'research' says doesn't exist.
: Jeff NH6IL

But Jeff, you still apparently don't get it that none of us are advocating

the elimination of CW as a mode. The continued use of CW is your choice and I certainly don't want it "eliminated" as a mode...BUT that doesn't justify the continued testing at 13/20wpm to gain access to most of the amateur HF frequencies.

The fact that CW is still being used by hams (and by some non-hams) does not support the continued use of a CW test as a pass/fail element for all other HF modes.

Personally, I'd love to see the first 25KHz of each HF amateur band set aside as CW only with a 20wpm code test and have only a 5wpm test (to satisfy current international agreements) for the rest of the HF amateur bands. Leave the theory as is for those that like incentive licensing to provide continued novice/general/advanced and extra class segments other than the 20wpm first 25KHz of each band.

Given the focus of the pro-code folks, I'm sure they'd gladly welcome anyone who can pass 20wpm into the first 25KHz segment. Indeed, since the focus is CW expertise, even a novice with a 20wpm certificate should be allowed access to those first 25KHz. Surely no pro-code supporter could be opposed to such an idea.

Cheers,
Bill Sohl K2UNK (billsohl@planet.net)

Date: 28 Aug 1994 13:51:21 GMT
From: psinntp!hk.super.net!hk.super.net!cocw@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Questions: Digital Scanning, Cellphones, Transmissions
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Laurent PELLISSIER (lpelliss@ensm-ales.fr) wrote:

: Here in France the GSM system is very very inexpensive. In fact
: some store sell one to you for FREE (but you have to subscribe for one
: year to a telephone company). Also they are two operators of the GSM in
: France (a third one is expected for soon!) so the competition between
: them is very hard and the price decrease a lot. For example in the
: beginning of the GSM (3 years ago) a such device cost 6000 FF (1 US\$
: for 6 FF) now you can find some at less than 1000 FF. It's totally
: crazy (especially for scanner listener). Moreover the GSM system is
: scrambled so there is no {easy} way to listen them.
: So I am very surprised to learn that in the US the digital
: cellphones are so expensive.

Hi,
AFAIK, (maybe this has been discussed already) UK (and France) has the

cheapest GSM service available (phones and network). As an example in Hong Kong, Motorola 7200 are around HK\$ 8800 (1 US\$ = 7.73 HK\$), Nokia 2110 are around HK\$10k. The same phones cost about 150 - 250 GBP (UK) subject to a one year contract, add about 250 to 300 for no contract (usually referred to as ESN free, as the service provider holds it). Most of the world uses GSM, USA, Russia and Japan excepted. Great shame.

There are many major operators (service providers) in the UK, four digital, two analogue. (2 GSM + 2 DSC [like GSM but at 1.8GHz]).

regards
Chun

Date: Sun, 28 Aug 94 22:10:45 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Quit whining and learn the damn code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Andrew C Robertson <drewbob@mit.edu> writes:

>Believe me, it is NOT THAT HARD. All it takes is a little effort.

No, it also takes ability. Not everyone is capable of learning every subject; just because you were able to learn code with "a little effort" doesn't mean that I, or even your twin brother (if any), can do the same.

>Who cares if CW is a dinosaur? Who cares if it has finally vanished from
>commercial use? Who cares about commercial use at all, anyway? This is
>*amateur* radio. I don't see the commercial/governmental abandonment of CW
>as being relevant. As long as there is at least a significant minority of
>hams using CW, then there are valid arguments for maintaining CW-only
>subbands, and perhaps for an HF CW proficiency requirement as well (if not
>for HF entirely, then for the use of the CW frequencies).

Very true...this is amateur radio, not a fixed, mobile or other commercial service. That doesn't mean that a code test should be required for access to amateur HF spectrum using modes other than code -- though your idea of keeping the code test to authorize CW makes sense, just as it does in the maritime mobile service.

>And for all you digital enthusiasts (myself included), you must know that
>most of your computers won't be worth squat after an EMP. CW will be the
>first thing to punch through.....

Which doesn't mean that the no-code HF licensee will be any worse off in such an (increasingly unlikely) situation than he would be with no HF privileges at

all, as would be the case under present regulations.

-- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

Date: 28 Aug 1994 13:46:54 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!sunic!news.tele.fi!
news.funet.fi!ousrvr.oulu.fi!oulu.fi!luru@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Repeater Coordination (qu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Cv8u00.8IC@world.std.com> drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

> And as for the FCC not "owning" frequencies, that's true - they
> administer them in trust for the American people who do own them.

Wow!

Any chance for us non-americans to get a couple of kHz somewhere as a
donation..?

Luru

Date: Sun, 28 Aug 94 22:17:08 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <d3.1125.126@alley.com>, <Cv8u00.8IC@world.std.com>,
<33qqbl\$11l@ccnet.ccnet.com>
Subject : Re: Repeaters Make M0ney Fa\$t

Bob Wilkins n6fri <rwilkins@ccnet.com> writes:

>In areas where coordinations can be transfered to an other amateur, the
>practice of warehousing spectrum is quite prevalent. You will find all
>repeater frequencies filled with amateur repeaters. The new stations have
>to go to the higher repeater bands. In order to put up a 2meter or 440
>repeater one has to buy a junk box that has been coordinated. In areas of
>high demand these clunkers can may cost five or ten thousand dollars more
>than the actual cost of the equipment.

>

>Is this good public policy?

He-- no!

Date: Sun, 28 Aug 1994 06:03:46 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!sdd.hp.com!
saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!news.doit.wisc.edu!F180-171.net.wisc.edu!
bmicales@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <gradyCv5z21.DM8@netcom.com>,
<bmicales.243.2E5ED508@facstaff.wisc.edu>, <Anthony_Pelliccio-270894183544@tonto-
slip9.cis.brown.edu>c.edu
Subject : Re: QST Subscription?

In article <Anthony_Pelliccio-270894183544@tonto-slip9.cis.brown.edu>
Anthony_Pelliccio@brown.edu (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>In article <bmicales.243.2E5ED508@facstaff.wisc.edu>,
>bmicales@facstaff.wisc.edu (Bruce Micales) wrote:
>> Circulation Manager - Debra Jahnke
>> Deputy Circulation Manager - Katherine Fay, N1GZ0
>>
>> 225 Main St.
>> Newington, CT 06111-1494
>> Telephone: 203-666-1541
>> Telex: 650215-5052 MCI
>> Fax: 203-665-7531 (24 hour direct line)
>> ARRL BBS: 203-666-0578

>Internet:

>Anyone of importance at the league has email addrs formed by the first
>letter of their first name, and their last name strung together. So the
>format is FIRSTINITIAL+LASTNAME@ARRL.ORG -ie... djahnke@arrl.org

Thanks Tony,
I was not aware of this.

Bruce Micales
WA2DEU

Date: 28 Aug 1994 06:48:51 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd.lkg.dec.com!iamu.chi.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <wyn.131.2E50FF69@ornl.gov>, <3348os\$st2@abyss.West.Sun.COM>,

<Cv7t2B.Mv6@news.Hawaii.Edu>rl
Reply-To : little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little)
Subject : Re: CW ...IS NOW!

Glad to see this inane argument is still going on. Can't wait until the FCC finally settles it once and for all and lowers/drops the code requirements. In any case:

In article <Cv7t2B.Mv6@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

|>In article <32qi54\$dn1@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@Eng.Sun.COM (Dana Myers) writes:

|>

|>> People who want to learn CW will, and those who want to use

|>>it will continue to use it (I know I will).

|>

|>People who want to learn the alphabet will do so on their own and

|>shouldn't be forced to do so in school.

My children never learned the alphabet school, and they seem to be doing fine.

|>

|>People who want to become an engineer will study engineering on their

|>own and shouldn't be forced to study it in college.

Most of the really talented engineers I know either never went to college or never finished their degrees as what they were learning in school was crap as compared to actually doing it. Certainly doesn't appear that a college degree is a necessity to success, after all, ask Bill Gates!

|>Anyway, I never would have learned the code out of choice but now I

|>sure am glad I was 'forced' to learn it - I would have never under-

|>taken the work of building my own equipment otherwise.

I see the correlation, it's blinding obvious, learning Morse code leads to home brewing. Give us a break. Also, glad to hear you're into S&M or is it D&S? I can't remember which it is that likes being forced to do things.

|>

|>Too bad you folks still aren't getting the idea behind having to

|>learn it. Part 97 calls for a pool of trained operators - trained

|>in what? Operating, building, and repairing for starters. How does

|>one become trained in building? Self-training through building one's

|>own equipment. And in starting one's self-training in building what

|>should one build? Of course you know the answer: CW transmitters using

|>discrete components. This is the way it's always been because it's the

Using this argument says we should be learning how to build spark transmitters, after all, they're also an ancient art. Why not be a real ham and build a real transmitter, you know, one that can do more than turn a carrier on and off? Building a switched oscillator certainly doesn't teach you very much.

|>I guess the FCC and us pro-code folks are the only ones who truly
|>understand this concept.

Yup, again the connection between learning code, understanding modulation techniques, learning electronics theory, and developing construction techniques is completely obvious, isn't it????

I think all you pro-coders are scared to death of becoming extinct or that the FCC will do to CW what they did to spark. Not that I'm advocating the demise of CW as I enjoy the easy pickings on 30 meters.

Thanks again Jeffrey for another illuminating post. I'm so glad I haven't been following this for a while. It's sort of like a soap opera. Miss several weeks or months and it's no big deal, you can pick up right where you left off.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: 28 Aug 1994 03:33:04 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!udel!
news.sprintlink.net!jupiter.planet.net!earth.planet.net!billsohl@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <332nkj\$a0o\$1@mhadf.inhouse.compuserve.com>,
<082094090343Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <Cv84z2.3pC@news.Hawaii.Edu>et.ne
Subject : Re: Code Must GO! or stay!?

Jeffrey Herman (jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu) wrote:
: In article <082094090343Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)
writes:

: >
: >How is that again? Which of the goals of the ARS as expressed in Part 97
: >is met by the morse testing?

: You just don't get it, do you Dan? Here, let me summarize:
: One purpose of the ARS: Pool of trained operators.
: Trained in what? Operating, building, repairing.
: Building? Yes, self-trained.
: How to start building? Start with learning to read schematics,

: learn about all the various components used, and how components
: work together to form various stages.
: What should one build first?

So far, no problem

: How about a 3-transistor CW transmitter -
: only takes a couple hours - all parts can be found in a junked tv set;
: build an antenna tuner: an inductor and a variable cap are all that's
: needed; string up a dipole antenna and you're on the air. Next, when
: you tire of crystal-control operation, build a VFO to replace the
: xtal.

Still, no problem.

Additional construction projects deleted for brevity.

: built and applying that to commercially made equipment, thus satisfying
: one of our purposes as laid out in Part 97.
: This is a summary of just one scenario. I'll come up with different ones
: each time you ask ``Why should we have to learn the code?''

And none of the above presents any supporting arguments for requiring
code. Why Jeff presumes that knowledge of CW will suddenly lead
the new ham down the homebrew road is beyond my comprehension.

Bill Sohl K2UNK (billsohl@planet.com)

Date: Sun, 28 Aug 1994 06:29:11 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!sdd.hp.com!saimiri.prima.te.wisc.edu!news.doit.wisc.edu!
F180-171.net.wisc.edu!bmicales@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <40.3198.2427@channel1.com>, <Cv859B.3tD@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<33p1el\$bbf@jupiter.planet.net>uc.edu
Subject : Testing for Operation Proficiency

I have proposed a testing system that would allow the person taking the
test to select their mode for proficiency of operation (this seems to be the
reason why CW is required for HF access. Our friends from the ITU ?).

Assuming, we are only testing for operation proficiency, let the testee
determine the mode at which they will be tested. Modes that could be use:
CW, SSB, packet (on HF)...any other suggestions?

I prefer CW however others do not share this opinion..fine. I would like to know what others think of this idea. It perserves the idea of testing for operational proficiency while at the same time allowing other modes to be used for testing.

This is just an idea so flames, rude comments, etc. are not needed or appreciated. Your thoughts, however, are appericiated.

73 de WA2DEU
Bruce Micales

P.S. Sorry for repeating myself, I would just like some feedback on this idea.

Thanks again
Bruce

Date: 28 Aug 94 15:44:06 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!news.Stanford.EDU!
abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!paulf@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <082094090343Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <Cv84z2.3pC@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<33p0hg\$bbf@jupiter.planet.net>
Subject : Re: Code Must GO! or stay!?

billsohl@earth.planet.net (Bill Sohl Budd Lake) writes:

>And none of the above presents any supporting arguments for requiring
>code. Why Jeff presumes that knowledge of CW will suddenly lead
>the new ham down the homebrew road is beyond my comprehension.

Okay, I'll make it more obvious for you, Bill. Given the complexity of most modern transceivers, most hams will *never* build rigs to do SSB or FM. CW rigs, however, are within the realm of possibility for a much wider audience. So, for most folks, homebrew will mean CW.

Now, of course, we'd like to encourage that, since a positive construction experience with a simple rig just *might* encourage them to attempt something more complex. Constructing the rig is only part of that experience; actually *using* it successfully is the far more rewarding half. Which is good incentive to keep the lower end of the bands well stocked.

Personally, I think this argument is somewhat tangential, but it does show that operating and experimenting aren't necessarily at odds.

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The Enemy of the Good is the Better."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Gen. William "Wild Bill" Donovan

Date: 28 Aug 1994 16:29:18 GMT
From: news.sprintlink.net!jupiter.planet.net!earth.planet.net!
billsohl@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Cv84z2.3pC@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <33p0hg\$bbf@jupiter.planet.net>,
<paulf.778088646@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>
Subject : Re: Code Must GO! or stay!?

Paul Flaherty (paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU) wrote:

: billsohl@earth.planet.net (Bill Sohl Budd Lake) writes:

: >And none of the above presents any supporting arguments for requiring
: >code. Why Jeff presumes that knowledge of CW will suddenly lead
: >the new ham down the homebrew road is beyond my comprehension.

: Okay, I'll make it more obvious for you, Bill. Given the complexity of most
: modern transceivers, most hams will *never* build rigs to do SSB or FM. CW
: rigs, however, are within the realm of possibility for a much wider audience.
: So, for most folks, homebrew will mean CW.

: Now, of course, we'd like to encourage that, since a positive construction
: experience with a simple rig just *might* encourage them to attempt something
: more complex. Constructing the rig is only part of that experience; actually
: *using* it successfully is the far more rewarding half. Which is good
: incentive to keep the lower end of the bands well stocked.
: Personally, I think this argument is somewhat tangential, but it does show
: that operating and experimenting aren't necessarily at odds.
: --Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The Enemy of the Good is the Better."

But Paul, your premise (That only those that know code will ever attempt
a CW transmitter homebrew project) is (in the words of Mr. Spock) illogical.
I can equally argue that anyone interested in building a CW homebrew
project will learn CW in order to use and will not be reluctant to
begin such a project simply because s/he has yet to learn the code.

Now let me also suggest that nothing in 97.1 of the amateur regs
is so specific as to having all or any hams that are technicians
as their major interest. There are lots of ways we can contribute
to the radio art/advancement without having to be electronic
technicians, etc. Frankly, today's needs are far more likely to
need hams who are proficient operators using voice and/or data

networks as opposed to CW.

For those that insist knowledge of CW is critical to emergency operations, let me add another data point as to the lack of CW use by the military. I was an electronic technician in the Navy on a destroyer for 4 years (1966-1970) and CW was NEVER used in any regular radio operations. The only CW use was an occasional CW practice net that the radiomen participated in. In four years on the same ship (numerous at sea activities including Vietnam service) we never used CW as the communications mode.

Bill Sohl K2UNK (billsohl@planet.net)

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #400
